

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

STEVEN ODOM,

Plaintiff,

v.

E. COE HILL, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE No. 1:21-cv-403

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Kent’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 151) and Plaintiff’s Objection to the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 155). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where, as here, a party has objected to portions of a Report and Recommendation, “[t]he district judge . . . has a duty to reject the magistrate judge’s recommendation unless, on de novo reconsideration, he or she finds it justified.” 12 WRIGHT, MILLER, & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3070.2, at 381 (2d ed. 1997). Specifically, the Rules provide that:

The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

FED R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). De novo review in these circumstances requires at least a review of the evidence before the Magistrate Judge. *Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981). The Court has reviewed de novo the claims and evidence presented to the Magistrate Judge; the

Report and Recommendation itself; and Plaintiff's objections. After its review, the Court finds the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is factually sound and legally correct.

The Magistrate Judge recommends granting Defendants' Quellette and Hill's respective Motions for Summary Judgment (ECF Nos. 124, 141). In his objections, Plaintiff primarily reiterates and expands upon arguments already considered by the Magistrate Judge. The Magistrate Judge properly analyzed Plaintiff's claims. Nothing in Plaintiff's Objections changes the fundamental analysis. The Court agrees that the defense motions should be granted for the very reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge.

**ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 151) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Quellette's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 124) is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Hill's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 141) is **GRANTED**.

This case is **CLOSED**. A separate Judgment shall issue.

Dated: January 29, 2025

/s/ Robert J. Jonker  
ROBERT J. JONKER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE